

REMARKS

Claims 2-4, 7-9, 11-13, 16-18, 21-23, 25-29, 31, 32, 38-40, 43-45, and 48-50 remain in the application and claims 2, 7, 11, 16, 21, 27, 38, 43, and 48 have been amended hereby.

The objected claims in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of the Office Action have been amended to address the Examiner's objections. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the claims is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 2-4, 7-9, 11-13, 16-18, 21-23, 27-29, 38-40, 43-45, and 48-50 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Uchida et al. in view of Gitlin et al.

Features of the present invention are a base station (e.g. Fig. 10) including discrimination means (e.g. Fig. 11) for discriminating whether a received signal is a multicarrier signal or a single carrier signal so that a demodulation process conforming to the type of received signal is carried out by a receiving means based on a result of the discrimination means. The discrimination means including an error detecting means (e.g. 184 and 185 in Fig. 11) for performing error detection on the received signal before the discrimination operation (e.g. 186 in Fig. 11).

The Office Action at paragraph 4 cites Uchida et al. (Fig. 4, items 30 and 36, and col. 15, lines 46-49 and 60-63) as teaching the above-noted features of the present invention recited in amended independent claims 2, 7, 11, 16, 21, 27, 38, 43, and 48.

It is respectfully submitted that Uchida et al. fails to

show or suggest discrimination means for discriminating whether a received signal is a multicarrier signal or a single carrier signal so that a demodulation process conforming to the type of received signal is carried out by a receiving means based on a result of the discrimination means, the discrimination means including an error detecting means for performing error detection on the received signal before the discrimination operation.

The cited sections of Uchida et al. are merely teaching the use of a speech coding/decoding processor for compressing/decompressing speech information which is unrelated to the claimed discrimination means and, because there are no features in Gitlin et al. that somehow could be combined with Uchida et al. and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 2, 7, 11, 16, 21, 27, 38, 43, and 48, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Uchida et al. in view of Gitlin et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 25, 26, 31, and 32 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Uchida et al. in view of Gitlin et al. and further in view of Igarashi.

Claims 25 and 26 depend from claim 21, and claims 31 and 32 depend from claim 27, respectively, which rejections over Uchida et al. in view of Gitlin et al. have been addressed above and, because there are no features in Igarashi that somehow could be combined with Uchida et al. and Gitlin et al. and result in the presently claimed invention, it is

respectfully submitted that claims 25, 26, 31, and 32 are patentably distinct over Uchida et al. in view of Gitlin et al. and further in view of Igarashi.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
COOPER & DUNHAM, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jay H. Maioli". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Jay" and last name "Maioli" being clearly legible.

Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27,213

JHM/PCF:pmc